

Alaska

Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission

**for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)**

Due: September 1, 2003

**Amended December 29, 2003 for
Performance Indicator 2.1**

**Amended August 31, 2010 for
Performance Indicator 2.1 A & C**



**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202**

Instructions for Completing the Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission

As described in the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, States' submissions of their consolidated applications have been divided into multiple submissions and information requests. The information States are to provide in their September 1, 2003, consolidated applications is listed below.

Summary of Information Required for September 1, 2003 Submission

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for ESEA GOALS AND ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- 2.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

Performance goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

- 3.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).
- 3.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, "professional development," is defined in section 9101 (34)).
- 3.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d)).

Performance goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

- 4.1 Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

- 5.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma.
- 5.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school.

This workbook format has been developed to facilitate preparation and submission of the information required in this September 1, 2003, submission. States may use this format or another format of their choosing provided that all required information is provided in a clear and concise manner. The deadline for submission of this application is September 1, 2003.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400
(202) 401-0113

ESEA GOALS and ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Indicator 2.1: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

For this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, States must report information related to their standards and assessments for English language proficiency and baseline data and performance targets for ESEA Performance Indicator 2.1.

A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards and Assessments

Please describe the status of the State's efforts to establish ELP standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:

- **Address grades K through 12**
- **Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing**
- **Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006)**

STATE RESPONSE

In partnership with educators throughout the state, the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development is developing Alaska's English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards for grades K-12. These standards define progressive levels of competence in the acquisition of English for four domains: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Proficiency will be reported at five levels: beginning, early intermediate, intermediate, advanced intermediate, and proficient/fluent. The English language proficiency levels set clear benchmarks of progress that reflect differences for students entering school at various grade levels.

In order to facilitate students' transitioning into regular education content classes, and in accordance with NCLB requirements, the ELP Standards are linked to existing academic content standards. Additionally, the ELP Standards are designed to guide language acquisition allowing ELL students to successfully participate in regular education classes.

The first draft of the ELP Standards has been completed and reviewed by a statewide review committee comprised of teachers, administrators, special educators, parents, higher education and business representatives. Comments from the review committee will be incorporated into the next draft of the standards by the standards writers and will be submitted to the State Board of Education for approval at the March 16, 2004 meeting. After a period of public comment, the standards could be adopted at the June 10, 2004 meeting.

August 31, 2010 Updated Information:

In November 2005, a new English Language Proficiency Standards Review Committee met for the purpose of reexamining the 2004 Alaska ELP Standards. Recently adopted Alaska Grade Level Expectations in language arts, math, and science and extensive ELP standards development completed by other states and consortia over the last two years necessitated the review prior to aligning the standards with the newly adopted state ELP assessment. The revised 2005 ELP Standards were adopted by the State Board of Education & Early Development on March 16, 2006.

The ELP Standards are grouped by five grade spans (K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12) within domains.

- Four standards are outlined:
 1. Standard One: The learner will comprehend spoken English in a variety of personal, social, and academic contexts within the school setting.
 2. Standard Two: The learner will communicate in appropriate spoken English in a variety of personal, social, and academic contexts within the school setting.
 3. Standard Three: The learner will comprehend written English in personal, social, and academic contexts from print and non-print materials within the school setting.
 4. Standard Four: The learner will communicate in appropriate written English in a variety of personal, social, and academic contexts within the school setting.
- The standards and proficiency level descriptors address each of the four domains: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.
- Five proficiency levels are identified for each standard at each grade span. The fifth level is expanded to convey growth on the AMAOs. Limited English proficient students who score at the overall proficient level on the ELP assessment are exited from LEP status and services [4 ACC 34.055(d)].
 1. Beginning Low
 2. Beginning High
 3. Intermediate Low
 4. Intermediate High
 5. Proficient/Proficient High
- The standards are linked to the Alaska English/Language Arts Content Standards, Alaska Math Content Standards, and Alaska Science Content Standards as required by NCLB.

B. Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1

In the following table, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. English language proficiency baseline data should include all students in the State who were identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III supported programs.

1. The ELP baseline data should include the following:

- Total number of students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s);
- Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments; and
- A list of each of the ELP assessment(s) used to determine level of English language proficiency.

2. The baseline data should:

- Indicate all levels of English language proficiency; and
- Be aggregated at the State level.
- If a State is reporting data using an ELP composite score (e.g., a total score that consists of a sum or average of scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension), the State must:
 - Describe how the composite score was derived;
 - Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score; and
 - Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the required information.

ALASKA CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION SEPTEMBER 1, 2003 SUBMISSION
Performance Goal 2.1 Amended 8/31/2010

Alaska Baseline Data for 2002-2003					
ELP Assessment(s)	Total number of LEP Identified	Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1	Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2	Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3	Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4
(1)*	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
IPT	12607	9329 (74%)			3278 (26%)
LAS	849	603 (71%)			246 (29%)
WMLS	932	699 (75%)			233 (25%)
Other	5948	4580 (77%)			1368 (23%)
Total	20336	15211 (75%)			5125 (25%)

Note: For 2002-03, districts reported only if students were proficient or not proficient in English. The not-proficient students were listed as Level 1, even though students would have been at different levels of proficiency.

(1) List all of the State-selected ELP assessment(s) used during the 2002-2003 school year to assess LEP students.

(2) Total number of students identified as LEP according to ELP assessments(s).

(3-6) Number and percentage of students at each level of English language proficiency, as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments. If the State uses labels such as Level 1, Level 2, etc., the level at which students are designated "Proficient" should be indicated. For example, in this sample format, students at Level 4 are considered proficient in English. States should use the same ELP labels as defined in State ELP standards and assessment(s). If the ELP standards and assessment(s) define more than four levels, the table should be expanded to incorporate all levels.

Please provide the following additional information:

1. English language proficiency assessment(s) used, including the grades and domains addressed by each assessment (e.g., IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test (IPT I), grades K-6, listening and speaking).

Most districts in Alaska used the IPT I/II tests for grades K-12 in domains of speaking, listening, reading and writing. The LAS and Woodcock Munoz Language Survey were the second most-used tests for grades K-12. An assortment of other instruments were used by the rest of the districts, including such tests as LAU, DIAL, Gates MacGinitie, CELT, and IRI. Composite test scores were reported by the districts as either proficient or not-proficient across all domains.

2. Total number of students **assessed** for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments).

The total number of students assessed in 2002-03 for English language proficiency was 21,271.

3. Total number of students **identified** as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s)
(number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s)).

The total number of students identified as LEP in 2002-03 was 20,336.

C. Performance Targets (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives) for English Language Proficiency

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. Please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards. Please include in your response:

- **The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments**
- **A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English.**

STATE RESPONSE

Revised August 31, 2010

1. An LEP student is determined to be proficient if he or she achieves an overall proficiency level of proficient or proficient high on the annual English language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment (currently the IPT © 2005. The chart below that shows the overall proficient scale scores by grade level.

Grade Level	Beginner Low	Beginner High	Intermediate Low	Intermediate High	Proficient	Proficient High
K	< 512	513 - 653	654 - 719	720 - 767	768 - 898	>899
1	< 570	571 - 712	713 - 765	766 - 821	822 - 911	>912
2	< 581	582 - 725	726 - 779	780 - 826	827 - 924	>925
3	< 592	593 - 739	740 - 789	790 - 831	832 - 936	>937
4	< 603	604 - 752	753 - 799	800 - 854	855 - 953	>954
5	< 620	621 - 764	765 - 815	816 - 879	880 - 974	>975
6	< 642	643 - 779	780 - 833	834 - 904	905 - 994	>995
7	< 663	664 - 793	794 - 844	845 - 930	931 - 1014	>1015
8	< 685	686 - 810	811 - 861	862 - 933	934 - 1035	>1036
9-12	<706	707 - 831	832 - 883	884 - 964	965 - 1055	>1056

2. The overall proficiency scores on the IPT are derived from the total number of items in all 4 domains (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) of the test, and are expressed on the same standard score scale as the individual domains. The maximum cut point for the four sections was used to set the Overall proficiency cut points. This ensures that the student is at least at that level for all 4 domains of the test. The Comprehension scores for the IPT are derived from the total number of items in the Listening and Reading sections of the test, and are expressed on the same standard score scale as the individual sections. The Comprehension cut points were set at the maximum of the Listening and Reading cut points on the standard score scale for each proficiency level. This way, in order for a student to score at a particular proficiency level, he or she must be at least at that level for both Listening and Reading.
3. The criteria for attaining proficiency is that a student is counted as proficient in English if he or she scores at the Proficient or Proficient High level on the ELP Assessment. Students that score at least proficient on the ELP assessment are exited from LEP status at the end of the school year in which the assessment was taken.

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children making progress in learning English. Please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments. Please include in your response:

- A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments
- A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources)
- A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next

STATE RESPONSE

Revised August 31, 2010

Definition of Making Progress

An LEP student will be considered to have made progress in learning English if he or she has reached or exceeded his or her making progress goal for the year, or has attained proficiency.

Each student has an annual making progress target set individually based on the student's grade level and overall proficiency level on the ELP assessment in the first year of identification as an LEP student and a projected number of years to reach proficiency. The making progress target for each year is the difference between the student's overall proficiency target and the student's current standard overall score, divided by the number of expected years left to reach proficiency.

The number of expected years to reach proficiency in English is set according to the grade level and the level of overall proficiency during the initial year of assessment on the annual state English Language Proficiency Assessment, as shown in the following chart. The proficiency target is set at the minimum standard score at the grade level of expected overall proficiency. Each year the making progress goal for the next year (amount of progress on the standard score that student is expected to make each year) is calculated by finding the difference between the proficiency target and the student's current year overall standard score, divided by the number of years remaining to reach proficiency. Progress and Proficiency are reported in the IPT test results to districts.

Number of Expected Years to Reach Overall Proficiency in English				
Student Grade Level at Initial Identification as LEP	Overall Proficiency Level at Initial Identification as LEP			
	Beginner Low	Beginner High	Intermediate Low	Intermediate High
K	6	5	4	3
1st	6	5	4	3
2nd	6	5	4	3
3rd	6	5	4	3
4th	6	5	4	3
5th	6	5	4	3
6th	7	6	5	4
7th	7	6	5	4
8th	7	6	5	4
9th	7	6	5	4
10th	7	6	5	4
11th	7	6	5	4
12th	7	6	5	4

Note that newly identified LEP students are not considered in the making progress definition in their first year of participation in the annual ELP assessment.

In the table that follows, please provide performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for:

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English
- The percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency

Performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives are projections for increases in the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English and who will attain English language proficiency.

A table has been provided to accommodate States' varying approaches for establishing their performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives. Some States may establish the same performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for all grade levels in the State. Other States may establish separate performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for elementary, middle, and high school, for example. If a State establishes different performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for different grade levels/grade spans/cohorts, the State should complete a separate table for each grade level/grade span/cohort and indicate next to the "unit of analysis/cohort" the grade level/grade span/cohort to which the performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives apply.

Please provide the State's definition of cohort(s). Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

Revised August 31, 2010

While Alaska initially defined cohorts for grades K-5 and 6-12, the targets were reset beginning in the 2005-2006 school year for all students in grades K-12 without using cohorts for determining AMAO targets.

Alaska English Language Proficiency Performance Targets/Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives

*Unit of Analysis/Cohort: Grade Spans and Language

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans)

Grade Spans K-12

English Language Proficiency Targets	Percent or Number of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	Percent or Number of LEP Students Attaining Proficiency/Fluency
2009-2010	37% of all identified LEP students, except the LEP students who have taken the ELP assessment for the first time, are expected to meet the definition of making progress.	15% of all identified LEP students are expected to meet the definition of attaining proficiency.
2010-2011	40% of all identified LEP students, except the LEP students who have taken the ELP assessment for the first time, are expected to meet the definition of making progress.	16% of all identified LEP students are expected to meet the definition of attaining proficiency.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.1: The percentage of classes being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).

NCLB places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The new Title II programs focus on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals and requires States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching in core academic subjects. (The term “core academic subjects” means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography (*Section 9101(11)*). For more detailed information on highly qualified teachers, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIIguidance2002.doc>

A. In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “high-poverty” schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by “highly qualified” teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high-poverty schools in the State in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects that will be taught by highly qualified teachers by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers State Aggregate	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers High-Poverty Schools
2002-2003 Baseline	16%	16%
2003-2004 Target	65%	65%
2004-2005 Target	82%	82%
2005-2006 Target	100%	100%

Current data collections do not include highly qualified by district and by class, however based on our definition, which is from NCLB, we can make estimates of the number of highly qualified teachers.

In 2002-2003 we had 8325 teachers in Alaska. Of that total 6018 taught in an NCLB core area. Of those:

3601 taught P-6 (including K-12)

780 taught 7-8

1637 taught 9-12 (611 rural, 1026 urban based on CCD assigned local codes)

Under the definition our P-6 teachers are not highly qualified, and typically the 7-8 teachers are not highly qualified in one of the areas they teach. Of our 9-12 teachers we can estimate that 80% of teachers in urban areas are highly qualified, and 20% in rural areas are highly qualified. Therefore our baseline data would indicate we have 942 teachers who are highly qualified, however we do not have data that indicates this by classes taught at this time.

B. To best understand the data provided by States, please provide the State's definition of a highly qualified teacher below.

HIGHLY QUALIFIED- The term highly qualified when used with respect to any public elementary school or secondary school teacher teaching in Alaska, means that —

- (i) the teacher has obtained full Alaska State certification as a teacher (including certification obtained through alternative routes to certification) or passed the selected State of Alaska teacher licensing examination, and holds a license to teach in such State, **except that when used with respect to any teacher teaching in a public charter school, the term means that the teacher meets the requirements set forth in the State's public charter school law;** and
- (ii) the teacher has not had certification or licensure requirements waived on an emergency, temporary, or provisional basis;

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.2: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, “professional development,” is defined in section 9101 (34).)

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term “high-quality professional development” means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA. For more detailed information on high-quality professional development, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIguidance2002.doc>

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of teachers who received “high-quality professional development” in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of teachers who will receive “high-quality professional development” through the 2005-2006 school year. The data for this element should include all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development
2002-2003 Baseline	100%
2003-2004 Target	100%
2004-2005 Target	100%
2005-2006 Target	100%

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.3: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d).)

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SASA/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who were qualified, as defined above, in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who will be qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2002-2003 Baseline	27%
2003-2004 Target	47%
2004-2005 Target	77%
2005-2006 Target	100%

Baseline data and performance targets for Goal 4, Performance Indicator 4.1: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS/unsafeschoolchoice.doc>.

For baseline data, please provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous by the start of the 2003-2004 school year. For performance targets, please provide the number of schools that will be identified as persistently dangerous through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2003-2004 Baseline	0
2004-2005 Target	0
2005-2006 Target	0
2006-2007 Target	0
2007-2008 Target	0
2008-2009 Target	0
2009-2010 Target	0
2010-2011 Target	0
2011-2012 Target	0
2012-2013 Target	0
2013-2014 Target	0

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.1: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

In the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, indicator 5.1 read: “The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma – disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged—calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.” However, section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State’s academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

The Secretary approved each State’s definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State’s accountability plan. To reduce burden, provide flexibility, and promote more consistent data collection by the Department, we ask that the information you submit in this September 1, 2003, consolidated State application reflect this Title I definition rather than the definition used in the NCES Common Core of Data.

Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State’s accountability plan, in the following charts please provide baseline data and performance targets for the graduation rate. For baseline data, please provide the graduation rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For performance targets, please indicate what the State graduation rate will be through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data: GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	High School Graduation Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline
All Students	84.5%
African American/Black	76.6%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	81.1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	82.4%
Hispanic	77.0%
White	87.9%
Other	Not Collected in 01-02
Students with Disabilities	Not Collected in 01-02
Students without Disabilities	Not Collected in 01-02
Limited English Proficient	Not Collected in 01-02
Economically Disadvantaged	Not Collected in 01-02
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	Not Collected in 01-02
Migrant	Not Collected in 01-02
Male	79.2%
Female	90.0%

In 01-02 we did not collect graduation rate data in the manner approved by the Secretary of Education in the Accountability Workbook, therefore we are using the current base line data available, and setting targets based on the current data. When data is fully available from 02-03 we will have data as approved in the accountability plan, and will establish new targets that are reflective of those baseline data.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS: GRADUATION RATE**GRADUATION RATE**

Student Group	Baseline			04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14
	01-02	02-03	03-04										
All Students	84.5	85.8	87.1	88.4	89.7	91.0	92.2	93.5	94.8	96.1	97.4	98.7	100.0
African American	76.6	78.6	80.5	82.5	84.4	86.4	88.3	90.3	92.2	94.2	96.1	98.1	100.0
American Indian/AK Native	81.1	82.7	84.3	85.8	87.4	89.0	90.6	92.2	93.7	95.3	96.9	98.5	100.0
Asian	82.4	83.9	85.3	86.8	88.3	89.8	91.2	92.7	94.2	95.6	97.1	98.6	100.0
Hispanic	77.0	78.9	80.8	82.8	84.7	86.6	88.5	90.4	92.4	94.3	96.2	98.1	100.0
White	87.9	88.9	89.9	90.9	91.9	93.0	94.0	95.0	96.0	97.0	98.0	99.0	100.0
Other	N/A	75.5	77.8	80.0	82.3	84.6	86.9	89.1	91.4	93.7	95.9	98.2	100.0
Students with Disabilities	N/A	45.0	50.0	55.0	60.0	65.0	70.0	75.0	80.0	85.0	90.0	95.0	100.0
Students without Disabilities	N/A	90.0	90.9	91.8	92.7	93.6	94.5	95.5	96.4	97.3	98.2	99.1	100.0
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	79.0	80.9	82.8	84.7	86.6	88.5	90.5	92.4	94.3	96.2	98.1	100.0
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	94.0	94.5	95.1	95.6	96.2	96.7	97.3	97.8	98.4	98.9	99.5	100.0
Migrant	N/A	82.0	83.6	85.3	86.9	88.5	90.2	91.8	93.5	95.1	96.7	98.4	100.0
Male	79.2	80.9	82.7	84.4	86.1	87.9	89.6	91.3	93.0	94.8	96.5	98.2	100.0
Female	90.0	90.8	91.7	92.5	93.3	94.2	95.0	95.8	96.6	97.5	98.3	99.1	100.0

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.2: The percentage of students who drop out of school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following charts, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged. For baseline data, in the following charts please indicate the State high school dropout rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For targets, please indicate the State high school dropout rate through the 2013-2014 school year.

BASELINE DATA: DROPOUT RATE

Student Dropouts	Student Dropout Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline
All Students	5.8%
African American/Black	7.4%
American Indian/Native Alaskan	9.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	4.6%
Hispanic	6.0%
White	4.4%
Other	4.6%
Students with Disabilities	Not Collected in 01-02
Students without Disabilities	Not Collected in 01-02
Limited English Proficient	Not Collected in 01-02
Economically Disadvantaged	Not Collected in 01-02
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	Not Collected in 01-02
Migrant	Not Collected in 01-02
Male	6.4%
Female	5.0%

DROPOUT RATE

Student Group	Baseline		03-										
	01-02	02-03	04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14
All Students	5.8	5.3	4.8	4.4	3.9	3.4	2.9	2.4	1.9	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.0
African American	7.4	6.8	6.2	5.5	4.9	4.3	3.7	3.1	2.5	1.8	1.2	0.6	0.0
American Indian/AK Native	9.4	8.6	7.8	7.1	6.3	5.5	4.7	3.9	3.1	2.4	1.6	0.8	0.0
Asian	4.6	4.2	3.8	3.5	3.1	2.7	2.3	1.9	1.5	1.2	0.8	0.4	0.0
Hispanic	6.0	5.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.0
White	4.4	4.0	3.7	3.3	2.9	2.6	2.2	1.8	1.5	1.1	0.7	0.4	0.0
Other	4.6	4.2	3.8	3.5	3.1	2.7	2.3	1.9	1.5	1.2	0.8	0.4	0.0
Students with Disabilities	N/A	8.2	7.5	6.8	6.1	5.4	4.7	4.0	3.3	2.6	1.9	1.2	0.0
Students without Disabilities	N/A	4.2	3.8	3.4	3.1	2.7	2.3	1.9	1.5	1.1	0.8	0.4	0.0
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	11.0	10.0	9.0	8.0	7.0	6.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	0.0
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	5.2	4.7	4.3	3.8	3.3	2.8	2.4	1.9	1.4	0.9	0.5	0.0
Migrant	N/A	7.5	6.8	6.1	5.5	4.8	4.1	3.4	2.7	2.0	1.4	0.7	0.0
Male	6.4	5.9	5.3	4.8	4.3	3.7	3.2	2.7	2.1	1.6	1.1	0.5	0.0
Female	5.0	4.6	4.2	3.7	3.3	2.9	2.5	2.1	1.7	1.2	0.8	0.4	0.0